

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/650,045 08/29/2000		William T. Geddes Jr.	1034-01-PA	8375
	590 03/12/2007 I & SINGH I I P	EXAMINER		
KLEIN, O'NEILL & SINGH, LLP 43 CORPORATE PARK			THEIN, MARIA TERESA T	
SUITE 204 IRVINE, CA 926	506		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,,			3627	
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		03/12/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant	(s)		
		09/650,045	GEDDES	JR. ET AL.		
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Thein Marissa	3627			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication	n appears on the cover	sheet with the corresponde	ence address		
Period fo	• •					
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPUER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IN INTERPOLATION OF THE MAILING OF THE MAI	IG DATE OF THIS CO FR 1.136(a). In no event, howe on. period will apply and will expire S statute, cause the application to	MMUNICATION. ver, may a reply be timely filed IX (6) MONTHS from the mailing data become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. §	e of this communication. 133).		
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on	19 December 2006.				
•	• •	This action is non-fina	I.			
′=	since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
,	closed in accordance with the practice un	•	•			
Disnositi	on of Claims			•		
-	Claim(s) <u>286-297</u> is/are pending in the ap	nlication				
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with		tion			
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	ndiawii nom considere	uon.			
	Claim(s) <u>286-297</u> is/are rejected.	•	•			
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
	Claim(s) are subject to restriction a	and/or election requirer	nent.			
	on Papers					
-	The specification is objected to by the Exa					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)		-			
	Applicant may not request that any objection t		-	•		
111	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the c	•	- · · · · ·	• •		
-	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	ie Examiner. Note the	attached Office Action of I	omi P10-152.		
_	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for fo ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	reign priority under 35	U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).			
,	1. Certified copies of the priority docu	ments have been rece	ved.			
	2. Certified copies of the priority docu	*				
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
	application from the International B	ureau (PCT Rule 17.2)	a)).	· ·		
* 5	See the attached detailed Office action for	a list of the certified co	pies not received.			
lttachma-						
Attachmen	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892)	4\ <u> </u>	otoniou Summon (DTO 442)			
	e of References Cited (PTO-692) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-94	8) 4) LJ (nterview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date			
3) 🔲 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) 🛄 🛚	Notice of Informal Patent Applica	tion		
	r No(s)/Mail Date	6) 📙 (Other:			
. Patent and T	rademark Office ev. 08-06) Off	ice Action Summary	Part of Paper No			

Art Unit: 3627

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on December 19, 2006 has been entered.

Response to Amendment

The "Request for Continued Examination" filed on December 19, 2006 has been considered.

Claims 279-285 have been canceled. New claims 286-297 have been added and are pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 292-293 and 295-296 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The recitation of "wherein expanding" lacks antecedent basis.

Art Unit: 3627

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 286-297 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Canadian Demand Application No. 2,254,378 to Woodrow in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0049816 to Costin, IV et al.

Regarding claims 286, 287, 293 and 297, Woodrow discloses a method for allocating the proceeds of a business transactions over a network (page 19, line 8) comprising: determining if at least one responding provider matches and if at least one match occurs (page 12, line 24 – page13, line 21); generating a list of providers matching (page 9, lines 16-24); selecting the provider from the list of providers acceptable to user to conduct the business transactions (page 9, lines 16-24); determining an arrangement between the user and the provider, wherein the arrangement includes the user receiving the search object form the provider and a business transaction proceeds allocation ,where in the provider receives a potion of the business transaction proceeds, the at least user-specified beneficiary group receives a benefit in the form of a portion of the business transaction proceeds and the information server entity receives a fee (page 7, lines 20-24; page 12, lines 10-19; page 14, lines 8-14); repeating until the arrangement is acceptable to the user (page 15, lines 1-7; page

Art Unit: 3627

19, lines 5-10); and executing the business transaction (page 3, lines 7-20; page 13, line 1- page 14, line 23; Figure 5).

However, Woodrow does not explicitly disclose inputting user-specified parameters into the computer; searching for providers for the search object; generalizing the user-specified parameters, if no providers match the parameters or if the matches are unacceptable to the user; location of the provider; location of the user-specified beneficiary groups; and prioritizing the user-specified parameters. Woodrow does discloses the querying the database if the merchant and charities are participating in the system (page 2, line 24- page 3, line 6; page 13, lines 13-15; page 9, lines 16-22)

Costin, on the other hand, discloses the method comprising: inputting user-specified parameters into the computer (paragraphs 62-63; paragraph 80); searching for providers for the search object (paragraphs 62-63; paragraph 80; paragraph 85); determining if at least one responding provider matches (paragraphs 62-63; paragraph 80); generalizing the user-specified parameters, if no providers match the parameters or if the matches are unacceptable to the user (paragraphs 80-82); location of the user-specified beneficiary groups (paragraph 63); and prioritizing the user-specified parameters (paragraphs 62-63; paragraphs 80-82).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the method of Woodrow, to include disclose inputting user-specified parameters into the computer; searching for providers for the search object; generalizing the user-specified parameters, if no providers match the parameters or if the matches are unacceptable to the user, as taught by Costin, in order

Art Unit: 3627

to cause a marketing as a means to cost effectively enhance brand reputation, acquire customers, and contribute to charitable well being (Costin, paragraph 5).

Regarding claims 288, 290-293, and 294-296, Woodrow discloses the network is selected from the group consisting of the Internet, a communication system, a wired connection and a wireless connection (page 19, line 8) proceeds allocation is executed on the network (page 19, line 8; page 3, lines 7-20; page 13, line 1- page 14, line 23; Figure 5); location of the provider (page 11, line 5); a price offer (Figure 5; page 13, lines 2-4); adjusting the price offer (page 12, lines 10-19); adjusting the beneficiary group (page 9, lines 16-23).

Claims 289 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Woodrow and Costin, IV et al. as applied to claim 286 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,477,509.

Woodrow and Costin substantially discloses the claimed invention, however, the combination does not explicitly disclose offline transactions. Hammons, on the other hand, teaches offline transactions (col. 10, lines 18-21; col. 10, lines 52-59).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the combination, to include offline transaction, as taught by Hammons, in order to provide options in negotiating a transaction.

Allowable Subject Matter

The independent claim 286 would be allowable if the claim recites:

automatically prioritizing the beneficiaries or the prioritizing of the userspecified parameters in the generalizing step based on system loop; and Application/Control Number: 09/650,045 Page 6

Art Unit: 3627

- providing an acceptable criteria to why the user is accepting the arrangement in the repeating steps (g)-(h).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 286-297 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thein Marissa whose telephone number is 571-272-6764. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ryan Zeender can be reached on 571-272-6790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Page 7

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mtot March 4, 2007